



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

graphical views of France in the epics is to be explained by a reminiscence of a meaning which the *Monachus Sangallensis* declares himself willing to connect with the term *Francia*. But the *Monachus Sangallensis*, when he made his terminology, had no reason to fear that a misunderstanding would arise, because at his time Francia, as the Duchy of Francia, did not yet exist. It was different with the writers of France of a later period. They were limited by then existing facts. Had they ignored these facts they would have made a mistake, like to the statement of a writer who would designate England (the southern state of the island) as the United Kingdom (England, Scotland, Ireland). The case could be put even more strongly if we conceive that a British poet of the fifteenth century had at one time spoken of England in the specific sense, and again as England with its dependencies in France as one country.

Whether or not the 'Chanson de Roland' represents the work of different authors writing at different times, and especially whether it contains remnants of a very ancient poem dating back to 843 or farther, can only be decided by a careful and impartial study. It was an unfortunate slip on the part of Gautier to refer to the "natural frontiers" of France in discussing the 'Chanson de Roland,' and it is interesting to note that the remark was made in 1869. The poem is a masterpiece of literature requiring careful literary criticism and sober common sense in the detailed study of it.

C. A. EGGERT.

*Johns Hopkins University.*

#### GOTHIC TEXTS.

*The First Germanic Bible*, translated from the Greek by the Gothic bishop Wulfila in the fourth century, and the other remains of the Gothic language. Edited, with an introduction, a syntax, and a glossary, by G. H. BALG, Ph. D., author of a comparative glossary of the Gothic language, and editor of the English edition of Braune's Gothic grammar. New York: B. Westermann & Co., 1891, pp. 469.

The need of a new edition of the Gothic texts may well be questioned, as there are

several German editions, neater in print and cheaper in price than the one before us. But as an additional proof of the fact that the scientific study of English is beginning to take a firm foothold in America, we may welcome this first English edition of the remains of the Gothic language. The editor has had to contend with all the disadvantages of lack of a library necessary for scientific work; many of the shortcomings are due to these unfavorable circumstances. A visit to one of the larger institutions would have remedied some of these defects; yet as none of them is serious enough to impair the usefulness of the book, and judging that enthusiasm and zeal ought to count for something—we need too much of it not to be cautious in criticism—we want to express our recognition of Dr. Balg's scholarly efforts.

In spite of the great care taken in the preparation of this edition, a number of mistakes and misprints are to be found in it, especially in the Introduction,—p. xv. The number of extant leaves of the Codex Argenteus seems to meet with a strange fatum. Gabelentz and Loebe give the number as one hundred and eighty-eight (originally three hundred and thirty), of which eleven leaves were stolen; Heyne follows this calculation even in his eighth edition; Bernhardt deducts another ten; Braune corrects the mistake in the third edition of his grammar, after Ignaz Peters had published the result of his careful recount (cf. *Germania*, xxx, p. 314). Wright copies Heyne, and so does Balg in spite of quoting Peters' article for reference!—p. xviii. In the bibliography, ad 9, we miss: 'Gothicae Versionis Epistolarum divi Pauli ad Thessalonicenses secundae, ad Timotheum, ad Titum, ad Philemonem, quae supersunt,' edidit C. O. Castillionæus, Mediolani, 1839.—Ad 12: Gabelentz and Loebe's edition appeared in 1843-1846. (Goedeke, who is very unreliable in his dates, gives 1836-1846).—Ad 19: Uppström's edition of Ezra and Nehemia was published in 1864-68.—Ad 21: A second edition of Bosworth's Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels appeared in 1874.—Ad 23: L. Stamm died in 1861; the second edition appeared in 1860; the third edition (1865) was prepared by Heyne; the eighth appeared in 1885 (not 1888).—Ad 24:

If Hoppe and Mueller's unscholarly edition of the *Evangelium Marci* deserves mention, A. Schaefer's '*Aivaggeljo thairh Matthaiu*,' c. v-vii, Waldshut, 1881, ought also to have been admitted.

The text is a reprint of Bernhardt's second edition, as shown by the identity of several typographical errors—II Kor. vi, 8, Note: *jah pairh* in A, not *jap*. II Kor. v, 12, Note: *jan ni in hairtin* in A, not *jah*.—Ephes. iii, 13, Note: *in pizei* in B, to be omitted.—Glossary, sub *anafih*: *anafihis bókó*, not *bókós*. Further corrections are: P. 5, Note 13, *wigss* instead of *wiggs*.—P. 11. Math. xxv, 39: *jah atiddjedum*.—P. 18, Note 18, add: *Johannes* in C. A.—P. 32, v. 50. Heyne has *sijaiþ*.—P. 71, v. 58. Uppström, Gab.-Loebe, and Zahn have: *jäh gap du imma Jesus*, as required by the text.—P. 77, v. 6; add to the Note: *qipeiþ* in C. A. for *qepeiþ*.—P. 82, v. 29. About the emendation at *fairgunja*, cf. Mourek, "Gothische Praepositionen."—P. 100. Note 33: the first *i* in *greitandein* is erased in C. A., according to Uppström.—P. 125, c. iv, v. 5: *jap þan*, instead of *jah þan*.—P. 126, c. vi, v. 1: insert *jah* before *ni*. c. vii, v. 5, *ungahobainais*, for *ungahobeinais*.—P. 146, c. ix, v. 15, Note: *unusspillidons*, for *unosspillidons*. c. x, v. 2: *bidjan* in B., not *bidjam*.—P. 162, Note: *frijapwa* in A. belongs to verse 19.—P. 183. Note 17 must read: *frumei* in B.

In the glossary, several words are omitted.—P. 345. *gablindnan*, though occurring only in a gloss in A, ought to have been given (cf. *sihu*).—P. 350, *gakunnan*, w. and str. v.—P. 414, *saurga*, f.—P. 415, *sifan*, w. v.—P. 465, *vulan* is given as a strong verb (following Heyne); a question mark would have called attention to an unsettled point.—Misprints are, on p. 299: *Aillam* (cf. Heyne!) instead of the correct form *Ailam*, as in the text; Gabelentz and Loebe give the former in their text without comment; p. 346, *gadiliggs*, not *gadilliggs*.

A new feature of this edition is a syntax, pp. 222-292. Most of the material is drawn from dissertations and journal articles; a complete bibliography would have been helpful to the student. In the arrangement of his material, the author follows the time-honored classical scheme. No attempt is made towards a com-

parative study, although classical influences are occasionally mentioned. We do not wish to find fault with Dr. Balg either for the plan or the scope of his work; a work on syntax, particularly when the author must often choose between avoiding and touching upon ground not yet fully investigated, offers so many points where to apply the lever of criticism, that reviewers have unfortunately too often been betrayed into making agreement with their own point of view their test of merit. Dr. Balg's intention was to gather the most essential facts of Gothic syntax. In this he has succeeded; yet we think that a less liberal supply of illustrations and translations would not have detracted from the usefulness of the book. The space might have been profitably used for a fuller discussion of principles. We reserve a full review of this part of the edition for a later number of the Notes.

H. SCHMIDT-WARTENBERG.

University of Mississippi.

## CORRESPONDENCE.

### TWO CHAUCER NOTES.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In the note to l. 24 of the 'Reeve's Prologue,' Bell's edition, Mr. Jephson points out that the line is apparently derived from a similar expression in the 'Decameron,' in the Introduction to the Fourth Day. It has not, I believe, been noticed that Rabelais has it also, having probably borrowed it from Boccaccio. In Book 3, chap. 28, where Panurge is replying to Friar John, he says:

"Tu me reproches mon poil grisonnant, et ne considere point comment il est de la nature des pourraux, esquelz nous voyons la teste blanche et queue verte, droicte, et vigoureuse";

as given in the 'Edition Variorum,' vol. 5, p. 30. The editors of the Variorum seem to know nothing of the occurrence of the simile in either Boccaccio or Chaucer.

Several commentators have explained whence Chaucer drew his allusion to Plato, 'Prologue' 741-2 (cf. a similar quotation in the 'Manciple's Tale,' C. T. (Tyrw.) 17156-9, (Gillman) 18088-91):